



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 10/632,947  | 07/31/2003  | Alastair Hodges      | 104978-172               | 4975             |
| 45416 7590 01/05/2007<br>LIFESCAN/NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP<br>155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD<br>BOSTON, MA 02210-2604 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>OLSEN, KAJ K |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>1753         | PAPER NUMBER     |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE  |             | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE            |                  |
| 3 MONTHS  |             | 01/05/2007           | PAPER                    |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/632,947

Applicant(s)

HODGES ET AL.

Examiner

Kaj K. Olsen

Art Unit

1753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7-31-03;5-12-04;6-12-06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. On the IDS of 7-31-2003, a few of the US and Foreign references were crossed off because the applicant listed these documents earlier in the IDS. With respect to the various other documents that were crossed off, the applicant did not provide these various documents with the IDS nor were these references listed on any of the patents from the continuity chain of applications

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph 0001 of the specification should be amended to reflect that application 09/615,691 has matured into U.S. Patent No. 6,638,415.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Art Unit: 1753

*Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-20, and 27-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,638,415. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

5. All the limitations of claim 1 of the instant invention are present in claim 1 from the patent. Although claim 1 from the patent sets forth a number of additional limitations not present in claim 1 of the application, claim 1 of the application fully encompasses claim 1 of the patent. The various dependent claim limitations of the instant invention are either verbatim or substantially analogous to the various listed dependent claims limitations from the patent and also fully encompass the claims from the patent.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1753

7. Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Diebold et al (USP 5,437,999).

8. Diebold discloses a device comprising an electrochemical cell having a sensing chamber 49, a first electrode (17, 20), a second electrode (8, 11), an aperture 50 for admitting the sample in the sensing chamber. See fig. 1, 2, 5, and 6 and col. 5, ll. 3-15, col. 6, ll. 25-34, and col. 8, ll. 15-60. Diebold further discloses a reagent contained within the sample chamber (col. 10, ll. 14-60). Because the reagent in question is a osmium bipyridine complex, which is also disclosed by the instant invention (claim 9), it is inherently capable of undergoing a redox reaction directly with an analyte (including for oxidizing an antioxidant) to generate an electrical signal. With respect to the quantity of reagent being sufficient for only a single test, this would be met by Diebold regardless of whether Diebold had only enough reagent for one test or enough reagent for multiple tests, because the claims are constructed with open language (i.e. "comprising" and "contains"). Even if Diebold contained more than enough reagent, it would still contain enough reagent for only a single test.

9. With respect to the compositions of the first and second electrodes, see claims 15 and 16 of Diebold.

10. With respect to the use of a reagent that can reduce an oxidant, Diebold also teaches the use of a ferrocyanide salt (col. 12, ll. 27-32), which the instant invention evidences is capable of reducing an oxidant.

11. With respect to the use of a buffer, see Table 1 in col. 10.

12. With respect to the presence of an interface for connection to a meter, see col. 8, ll. 33-36. The interface would conduct both voltage and current. See col. 1, ll. 13-25.

Art Unit: 1753

13. With respect to the cell being a thin layer electrochemical cell, the device of Diebold would read on the defined "thin" giving the claim language its broadest reasonable interpretation.

14. Claims 7, 13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diebold in view of Nankai et al (USP 5,120,420).

15. With respect to claim 7, Diebold set forth all the limitations of the claim, but did not explicitly recite the use of a reference electrode in addition to the first and second electrodes. Nankai teaches in an alternate electrochemical cell that a three-electrode embodiment of a sensor (by adding a reference electrode) is more accurate than a two-electrode embodiment of the sensor. See col. 13, ll. 6-12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Nankai for the sensor of Diebold so as to provide a more accurate electrochemical sensor.

16. With respect to claim 13, Diebold set forth all the limitations of the claim, but did not explicitly disclose the use of any of the set forth buffer solutions. Nankai also teaches that a phosphate buffer is a conventional choice as a buffer for the reagent layer. See col. 4, l. 62 through col. 5, l. 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Nankai for the sensor of Diebold because the substitution of one known buffer for another known buffer requires only routine skill in the art.

17. With respect to claim 17, Diebold set forth all the limitations of the claim, but did not specify the distance between the first and second electrode. Nankai teaches that the spacer width that defines the capillary passage for the sensor should not be too large because that would require larger samples and would impede the capillary wicking of fluid into the chamber. Nankai taught that the spacer should be preferably down to 50 microns and more preferably

Art Unit: 1753

down to 100 microns. See col. 12, ll. 43-54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Nankai for the sensor of Diebold such that the sensor requires less sample and facilitates capillary wicking of the fluid. It is noted that Diebold is also interested in minimizing the amount of sample required for analysis. See the abstract and col. 12, ll. 39-42. Because the width of the measuring chamber in Diebold is the same thing as the spacing between the first and second electrodes, the incorporation of the spacing from Nankai for the measuring chamber of Diebold would result in a distance between the two electrodes of less than 150 microns.

18. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diebold.

19. Diebold set forth all the limitations of the claims, but did not explicitly teach the use of a heater for heating the sample. Graves teaches in an alternate electrochemical sensor that the addition of a heating element allows the temperature of the sensor and analyte to be precisely controlled (see abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Graves for the sensor of Diebold in order to provide a narrower sensor temperature range, which allows for more accurate measurements.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaj Olsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1344. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

Art Unit: 1753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen, can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AU 1753  
January 3, 2007



**KAJ K. OLSEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**